



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/204,585	12/03/1998	MARC TREMBLAY	SP-3288-US	5684

24251 7590 10/18/2002

SKJERVEN MORRILL LLP  
25 METRO DRIVE  
SUITE 700  
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER
----------

ENG, DAVID Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2002

19

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/204,585

**Applicant(s)**

TREMBLAY ET AL.

**Examiner**

DAVID Y. ENG

**Art Unit**

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 December 1998 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                      4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                      5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_                      6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2155

✓ The specification fails to disclose what 602 is in Figure 6.

✓ The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(o) because they fail to label all rectangular boxes with meaningful legends. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The active claims are 1-28.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1, 3-14 and 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yung (5,592,679) in view of Luan (5,911,149).

Claims 2 and 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yung (5,592,679) and Luan (5,911,149) further in view of Nashimoto (6,023,575).

P19/L16  
- 1'24/Lare  
Details of the rejections have already been set forth in the last Office action. The details are incorporated herein by reference thereto.

Applicants are requested to identify the components in the drawings which render the register file partitionable and the segments programmable and to identify the description of the components in the specification. See 37CFR 1.83(a).

In the communication filed on August 6, 2002, Applicants contended that the Examiner provides no specific cite to a portion of Luan other than a general referent to the Abstract and Summary. On the contrary, the Examiner clearly pointed out the specific area in Luan upon

Art Unit: 2155

which the rejection is relied upon. Abstract and Summary of the Laun reference are part of the disclosure of the invention in the specification of the Laun patent. The Examiner does not aware of any rules which prohibit the Examiner to rely on the Abstract and the Summary of a patent. Applicants further request the Examiner to point out the portions of Luan upon which the Examiner believes elements of the claims read. Note that Applicants' claims merely recite a register file. The register file is recited in a desired functional statement that the register file is partitionable and programmable. A register file by itself obviously is not partitionable and programmable. There is no element recited in the claims to render the register file partitionable and programmable. The Yung reference is cited for the showing of a plurality of functional units and a plurality of local registers and global registers. The Laun reference is cited to show that the local registers and the global registers in Yung can be implemented by a partitionable and programmable register file. As far as the rejections of the claims are concern, the mere fact that a register file is partitionable and programmable is sufficient.


In response to applicant's argument that the Yung reference and the Laun reference are not combinable, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Art Unit: 2155

Applicants further contended that none of the references teach partitioning of a register file. Partitionable is inherent in programmable.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'David Y. Eng', with a stylized flourish at the end.

DAVID Y. ENG  
PRIMARY EXAMINER